The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <u>not</u> written for publication and is <u>not</u> binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte PHILIP W. MILLER and MING PENG

Appeal No. 2006-0705 Application No. 09/692,257

ON BRIEF

MAILED

APR 1 9 2006

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Before FLEMING, <u>Chief Administrative Patent Judge</u>, HARKCOM, <u>Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge</u>, and ADAMS, <u>Administrative Patent Judge</u>.

Per curiam.

....

On March 29, 2006, counsel for the appellants filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR § 1.114. Pursuant to the notice entitled "Request for Continued Examination Practice and Changes to Provisional Application Practice," 65 Fed. Reg. 50092, 50095 (Aug. 16, 2000), and the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.114(d), a request for continued examination under 37 CFR § 1.114 filed after appeal has been taken, but prior to a decision on the appeal, "will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal and to reopen prosecution of the application before the examiner."

Accordingly, the appeal in this application is dismissed.

The application is being returned to the examiner for further action as may be appropriate.

Michael R. Fleming, Chief Administrative Patent Judge

Gary V. Harkcom, Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge

Donald E. Adams
Administrative Patent Judge

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Lawrence M. Lavin, Jr. Monsanto Company Mailzone E2NA 800 North Lindbergh Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63167

dem